



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,550	12/18/2001	Toshimichi Kishimoto	62807-023	9299
20277	7590	10/24/2005	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP			POLTORAK, PIOTR	
600 13TH STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			PAPER NUMBER	
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,550

Applicant(s)

KISHIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Peter Poltorak

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment, and remarks therein, received on 8/01/2005 have been entered and carefully considered.
2. The Amendment introduces a new limitation into the originally sole independent claims 1, 9 and 17. The newly introduced limitation has required a new search and consideration of the pending claims. The new search has resulted in newly discovered prior art. New grounds of rejection based on the newly discovered prior art follow below.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant suggests that the use of references cited in the previous Office Action rejection was confusing.
5. In the response in this Office Action the examiner makes a special attempt to clearly identify the references used. However, the examiner reminds applicant that certain references e.g. *Stallings* are used simply as an example of facts that are old and well-known practice and not necessarily used as the rejection art.
6. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but they were not found persuasive.
7. On pages 21-22 of the remarks dated 8/01/05 applicant argues the previous Office Action rejection based on the newly introduced limitations: "interfaces permitting an

Art Unit: 2134

access to said data file during said predetermined permission time” and “interfaces ... to be expired after a predetermined permission time”.

8. The first (cited above) limitation required an additional search and is addressed in this Office Action.
9. As the second (cited above) limitation the examiner disagrees that references provided in support of the fact that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to expire interfaces after a predetermined permission time. The *Stallings* reference has been provided to indicate an old and well known fact that any permissions should be associated with time. *Stallings* teaches that an attacker may take control of an object that allows access and associating this object with time (*a timestamp*) aims to minimize the duration of this threat (*Stallings, pg. 328*).

The examiner points out that applicant’s invention also deals with objects allowing access (*“interfaces permitting an access...”*) and as a result the reference even though illustrative is very much relevant to the case.

Stallings has been used as an example but applicant should appreciate various every day examples in use at the time of Applicant’s invention, wherein access expired after a predetermined time, e.g. cookies (*in electronic transactions such as web mail*).

10. On page 22 of the remarks dated 8/01/05, applicant refers to claim 6 and argues that the art of record does not disclose “an information file for storing a plurality of

Art Unit: 2134

functions of a remote method invocation protocol and a plurality of flags for defining which manager is permitted to use which function”.

11. The examiner refers applicant to § 40 in the previous Office Action.

12. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

14. The newly introduced limitation “an information file for storing a plurality of functions of a remote method invocation protocol each having permission time for a manager...” does not have support in the specification.

15. Claim 7 is rejected by virtue of its dependence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2134

1. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-10, 14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moshfeghi* (U.S. Patent No. 6476833) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453).
2. As per claim 9 *Moshfeghi* teaches a user entering authentication information (a user ID and a password). The application then authenticates the user and the user's access rights for example by invoking authentication methods on tier 2 servers which access information in the user directory and compare it to entered authenticating information. After authentication, user profile records are loaded to the memory of the end-user device. The application then displays a window configured according to directions in the loaded user profile records and the user commences application interaction with the application specific controls (*Moshfeghi*, col. 12 line 58 – col. 13 line 15).

This reads on a step of authentication wherein a second manager ID and a second password received from a manager accesses a data file, in accordance with a first ID and a first password stored beforehand; a step of creating interfaces for the manager if the authenticating of the second manger ID and the second password succeeds.

3. *Moshfeghi* does not teach that permitting access during a predetermined permission time.

Howard et al. and *Minasi* teach permitting access during a predetermined permission time (*Howard et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6353886, col. 6 lines 15-16; *Minasi* pg. 355-356).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to permit access during a predetermined permission time as taught by *Howard et al.* or *Minasi*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to specify the days and/or hours during which a particular manager can access resources (*data files*).

4. As per claims 1 and 17 *Moshfeghi*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not explicitly teach the interfaces to be expired after a predetermined time. However, the importance of revoking access after some predetermined time is well known in the art (*e.g. on pg. 328 Stallings teaches access revocation after a predetermined time and provides a motivation for implementing such a measure*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to expire the interfaces after a predetermined time. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to increase the system's security.

5. As per claims 6 and 14 *Moshfeghi* teaches that information exchange utilizes RMI (*col. 5 lines 21-31*). Furthermore *Moshfeghi* teaches that requests from the client applications to the business-server objects are intercepted by access decision facility, which checks whether the requesting user, who has the particular access control information stored in the user directory, is authorized to access the

information requested in view of the access control policies stored in the access control policy database (*col.8 lines 58-65*).

This reads on an information file for storing a plurality of functions of a RMI and a plurality of flags for defining which manager is permitted to use which function.

6. As per claims 2, 10 and 18 *Moshfeghi* teaches logoff functionality (*col. 13 lines 36-37*).
7. As per claims 8 and 16 Java Virtual Machine is the crucial piece of every Java installation that allows Java programs (applets) to run on computer platforms.
8. Claims 3-4, 11-12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moshfeghi* (U.S. Patent No. 6476833) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453) and further in view of *Stein* (Lincoln D. Stein, "Web Security, a step-by -step reference guide", 1998, ISBN: 0201634899).
9. *Moshfeghi*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* teach the manager accessing the interfaces received from the management object as discussed above.
10. *Moshfeghi*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not teach that the management object transmits a corresponding cipher key to the manager authenticated by the second manager ID and the second password, and the authenticated manager accesses the interfaces by using the cipher key.

Stein teaches a cipher key exchange to secure a session and communication parties communicating in encrypted mode (*Stein, Fig. 3.2 and pg. 41-42*).

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to configure the management object to transmit a corresponding cipher key to the manager certified by the second manager ID and the second password (*exchange cipher keys*), and the manager accesses the interfaces by using the cipher key (*switch into encrypted mode*) as taught by *Stein*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to ensure data confidentiality.

11. Limitations of claims 4, 12 and 20 are implicit. A storage management should be able to handle many requests.

12. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moshfeghi* (U.S. Patent No. 6476833) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453) and further in view of *Ludwig et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20020198829).

13. *Moshfeghi*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* teach creating interfaces by the management object by permitting an access to files as discussed above.

Moshfeghi, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not teach not creating the interfaces if a non-use period from the most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are authenticated.

Ludwig et al. discusses different security measures including password authentication and suggests disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity (*Ludwig et al. [51]*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to disable accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity as taught by *Ludwig et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to make sure that unused accounts are inactive.

Disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity would result in preventing the creation of interfaces if a non-use period from most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are authenticated.

14. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moshfeghi* (U.S. Patent No. 6476833) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453) and further in view of *Cabrera et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6029160).

15. *Moshfeghi*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* teach a system as discussed above.

16. *Moshfeghi*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not teach implementing a flag for temporarily stopping the use of the created interfaces in response to a maintenance request.

Cabrera et al. teach implementing a flag for temporarily stopping the use of objects in response to maintenance (*Cabrera et al. col. 6 lines 39-43*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement a flag for temporarily stopping the use of the created interfaces in response to a maintenance request as taught by *Cabrera et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to prevent any undesirable effects of accessing objects under maintenance.

17. Claims 1-2, 8-10, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harter et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6212564) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453).

18. As per claim 9 *Harter et al.* teach a client server environment (*Abstract and Fig. 5*) wherein a servlet running on the server receives the request for the applet launcher page based on the user identifier, password and device type. The servlet validates the user identifier and password and if they are valid the servlet generates or selects the applet launcher HTML page, which is optimal for the requested device. The servlet then returns the applet launcher page to the client (*Harter et al., Fig. 2 and col. 4 lines 14-22*).

This reads on a step of authentication a second manager ID and a second password received from a manager accessing to a data file, in accordance with a first ID and a first password stored beforehand and a step of creating interfaces for the manager if the authentication of the second manager ID and the second password succeeds.

19. *Harter et al.* do not teach permitting access during a predetermined permission time.

Art Unit: 2134

Howard et al. and *Minasi* teach permitting access during a predetermine permission time (*Howard et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6353886, col. 6 lines 15-16; *Minasi* pg. 355-356).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to permit access during a predetermined permission time as taught by *Howard et al.* or *Minasi*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to specify the days and/or hours during which a particular manager can access resources (*data files*).

20. As per claims 1 and 17 *Harter et al.*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not explicitly teach the interfaces to be expired after a predetermined time. However, the importance of revoking access after some predetermined time is well known in the art. (*For example, on pg. 328 Stallings discloses access revocation after a predetermined time and provides a motivation for implementing such a measure*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to expire the interfaces after a predetermined time. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to increase system's security.

21. As per claims 2, 10 and 18 *Harter et al.*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not explicitly teach the interfaces to be expired after a received log-out.

Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known practice to expire (the access) interfaces after a log-out has been received (*e.g. Microsoft Windows NT or Web session log-out finishes the session*). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

Art Unit: 2134

applicant's invention would expire interfaces after a log-out has been received in order to prevent any potential attacks or an unauthorized access.

22. Col. 3 line 52 – col. 4 line 13 in *Harter et al.* reads on the limitations of claims 8 and 16.

23. Claims 3-4, 11-12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harter et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6212564) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453) and further in view of *Stein* (Lincoln D. Stein, "Web Security, a step-by-step reference guide", 1998, ISBN: 0201634899).

24. *Harter et al.*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* teach the manager accessing the interfaces received from the management object as discussed above.

25. *Harter et al.*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not teach that the management object transmits a corresponding cipher key to the manager authenticated by the second manager ID and the second password, and the authenticated manager accesses the interfaces by using the cipher key.

Stein teaches a cipher key exchange to secure a session and communication parties communicating in encrypted mode (*Stein*, Fig. 3.2 and pg. 41-42). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to configure the management object to transmit a corresponding cipher key to the manager certified by the second manager ID and the second password (*exchange cipher keys*), and the manager accesses the interfaces by using the cipher key

(switch into encrypted mode) as taught by *Stein*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to ensure data confidentiality.

26. Limitations of claims 4, 12 and 20 are implicit. A storage management would have been used to handle many requests.

27. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Harter et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6212564) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453) and further in view of *Ludwig et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20020198829).

28. *Harter et al.*, *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* teach creating interfaces by the management object by permitting an access to files as discussed above.

Harter et al., *Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not teach not creating the interfaces if a non-use period from the most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are authenticated.

Ludwig et al. discusses different security measures including password authentication and suggests disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity (*Ludwig et al.* [51]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to disable accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity as taught by

Ludwig et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to make sure that unused accounts are inactive.

Disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity would result in preventing the creation of interfaces if a non-use period from most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are authenticated.

29. Claims 1-2, 8-10, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang* (U.S. Patent No. 6192361) in view of each of *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453).

30. As per claim 9 *Huang* teaches steps of a browser on a remote computer accessing a remote server, the remote server providing the remote computer with java applet that is used to communicate ID and password to the system manager; system security manager verifying the user ID and password against a database of IDs and passwords, and if the ID and password are valid GUI Launcher is launched (*Huang, Fig. 2 and col. 7 lines 9-24*).

This reads on a step of authentication a second manager ID and a second password received from a manager accessing a data file, in accordance with a first ID and a first password stored beforehand and a step of creating interfaces for the manager if the authenticating of the second manager ID and the second password succeeds. Furthermore *Huang* teaches System Management Interface (56) and Servers (60), in conjunction with the GUI Launcher (8) that permits users to access and

Art Unit: 2134

communicate with the system (230) (*Huang, Fig. 1 and col. 8 line 34- col. 9 line 6*), which reads on said interfaces permitting access by the manager.

31. *Huang* does not teach permitting access during a predetermined permission time.

Howard et al. and *Minasi* teach permitting access during a predetermined permission time (*Howard et al., U.S. Patent No. 6353886, col. 6 lines 15-16; Minasi pg. 355-356*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to permit access during a predetermined permission time as taught by *Howard et al.* or *Minasi*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to specify the days and/or hours during which a particular manager can access resources (*data files*).

32. As per claims 1-2, 10 and 17-18 *Huang* teaches that the system is used by multiple users (*Huang, Abstract, col. 2 lines 38-42, col. 6 lines 13-15, etc.*), and that when the remote computer terminates the logon session the remote computer does not retain java applet (*Huang, col. 7 lines 59-65*) and that interfaces expire after a predetermined time (*Huang, col. 15 lines 43*).

33. As per claims 8 and 16 Java Virtual Machine is the crucial piece of every Java installation that allows Java programs (applets) to run on computer platforms.

34. Claims 3-4, 11-12 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang* (*U.S. Patent No. 6192361*) in view of each *Howard et al.* (*U.S. Patent No. 6353886*) and *Minasi* (*Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition, 1999, ISBN: 0782124453*) and further in view of *Stein* (*Lincoln*

D. Stein, "Web Security, a step-by -step reference guide", 1998, ISBN: 0201634899).

35. *Huang, Howard et al. and Minasi* teach the manager accessing the interfaces received from the management object as discussed above.

36. *Huang, Howard et al. and Minasi* do not teach that the management object transmits a corresponding cipher key to the manager authenticated by the second manager ID and the second password, and the authenticated manager accesses the interfaces by using the cipher key.

Stein teaches a cipher key exchange to secure a session and communication parties communicating in encrypted mode (*Stein, Fig. 3.2 and pg. 41-42*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to configure the management object to transmit a corresponding cipher key to the manager certified by the second manager ID and the second password (*exchange cipher keys*), and the manager accesses the interfaces by using the cipher key (*switch into encrypted mode*) as taught by *Stein*. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to ensure data confidentiality.

37. The limitations of claims 4, 12 and 20 are implicit. A storage management should be able to handle many requests.

38. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang* (U.S. Patent No. 6192361) in view of each *Howard et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6353886) and *Minasi* (Mark Minasi, "Mastering Windows NT Server 4, 6th edition,

1999, ISBN: 0782124453) and further in view of *Ludwig et al.* (U.S. Pub. 20020198829).

39. *Huang, Howard et al.* and *Minasi* teach creating interfaces by the management object permitting an access to files as discussed above.

40. *Huang, Howard et al.* and *Minasi* do not teach not preventing the creation of interfaces if a non-use period from the most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are certified.

Ludwig et al. discusses different security measures including password authentication and suggests disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity (*Ludwig et al.* [51]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to disable accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity as taught by *Ludwig et al.* One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification in order to make sure that unused accounts are inactive.

Disabling accounts after a predetermined time of inactivity would result in preventing the creation of interfaces if a non-use period from most recent log-out of the manager exceeds a predetermined period when the second manager ID and the second password are authenticated.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Poltorak whose telephone number is (571)272-3840. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and alternate Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571) 272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2134

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).


Signature

10/13/08
Date


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100